

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 11, and 22 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 11, and 22.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 1-4, 8, 10-14, 19, and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,991,771 (“Falls”) in view of Patent Application Publication No. US2001/0034733 (“Prompt”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has asserted that Falls discloses: (1) generating a request for a projected object graph data structure using a variable usage specification; and (2) generating the projected object graph data structure using the request, a server graph data structure, and a schema associated with the server graph data structure (Office Action mailed May 17, 2004, page 3). The Applicant respectfully notes that Falls does not teach or suggest a projected object graph data structure, a variable usage specification, or generating a projected object graph data structure using the variable usage specification. Each of the aforementioned elements is discussed below.

Projected Object Graph Data Structure – The phrase “projected object graph data structure” corresponds to an object graph (*i.e.*, a collection of related objects) that may

include fewer than all of the objects in a non-projected object graph. Further, each object within the projected object graph data structure may include fewer attributes than listed in the schema that was used to generate the object. An example of a non-projected object graph is shown in Figure 2 of the Instant Specification, and a corresponding projected object graph is shown in Figure 3 of the Instant Specification. In contrast, Falls only teaches transferring a replica (*i.e.*, an exact copy) of an individual object (*see* Falls, col. 4, ll. 15-50) with no teaching or suggestion of transferring a sparsely populated object (*i.e.*, an object with fewer attributes than the attributes listed in the schema which was used to generate the object). Further, Falls does not teach or suggest transferring a projected object graph. Thus, Falls does not teach or suggest a project object graph data structure. Moreover, even assuming *arguendo* that Falls teaches a projected object graph, Falls fails to teach or suggest a variable usage specification used to generate the request for a projected object graph data structure.

Variable Usage Specification- The phrase “variable usage specification” corresponds to a specification that describes the application as a series of states and transitions. Further, the states represent information derived from objects (*see e.g.*, Instant Specification, paragraph [0019] – [0020]). Falls fails to teach or suggest such a variable usage specification. Further, the Examiner’s characterization of variable usage specification as a schema is incorrect. Specifically, the schema defines attributes of a specific object, while the variable usage specification describes the application as a series of states and transitions. Thus, the variable usage specification may not be characterized as a schema.

In addition, the Examiner does not rely on Prompt to teach a projected object graph data structure or a variable usage specification. Thus, the rejection is not supported by the prior art. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-7 and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Falls in view of Prompt, and further in view of Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0016412 (“Barnes”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Falls fails to teach a projected object graph data structure or a variable usage specification. Further, the Examiner does not rely on Prompt or Barnes to teach a projected object graph data structure or a variable usage specification. Thus, the rejection is not supported by the prior art. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Falls in view of Prompt, and further in view of Barnes, and further in view of Patent No. 6,063,128 (“Bentley”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Falls fails to teach a projected object graph data structure or a variable usage specification. Further, the Examiner does not rely on Prompt, Barnes, or Bentley to teach a projected object graph data structure or a variable usage specification. Thus, the rejection is not supported by the prior art. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 16159.018001).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/16/04



Jonathan P. Osha, Reg. No. 33,986
OSHA & MAY L.L.P.
One Houston Center, Suite 2800
1221 McKinney Street
Houston, TX 77010
Telephone: (713) 228-8600
Facsimile: (713) 228-8778

72706_1